

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed on February 16, 2006 has been given careful consideration by applicant. Reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the comments herein.

The Office Action

Claims 1-4, 8-14, and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Skantze, et al. (US Patent No. 6,722,574) in view of Ohmori, et al. (US Patent No. 6,339,431).

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skantze in view of Ohmori and further in view of Wolff (UK Patent Application No. 2306669 filed 10/30/1996).

First Obviousness Rejection

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 8-14, and 16-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Skantze, et al. (US Patent No. 6,722,574) in view of Ohmori, et al. (US Patent No. 6,339,431). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Skantze, et al. and Ohmori, et al. individually and in combination, do not teach or suggest the subject invention as set forth in the subject claims.

Independent claim 1 (and similarly independent claims 18 and 20) recite an interactive document processing system that identifies annotations in signal data from an input device by comparing the signal with image data of a rendered hardcopy document. A memory records the image data of a rendered hardcopy document together with an identifier that is associated with the image data. The identifier and the image data are recorded in the memory in response to rendering the hardcopy representation of the image data. Skantze and Ohmori individually and in combination do not teach or suggest such claimed aspects of the subject invention.

More particularly, Skantze and Ohmori do not teach or suggest recording an identifier and image data in memory in response to rendering a hardcopy representation of the image data. The examiner contends that such limitations are disclosed in Skantze, col. 12, lines 45-67. However, this section does not disclose recording an identifier and image data in memory in response to rendering a hardcopy representation of the image data.

Instead, this section discloses a business card with an electronic field that is employed by a user to transmit data from the business card to one or more recipients. One or more check boxes can indicate whether additional information is going to be transmitted from the business card. The check box serves as an additional input a user can employ to send additional information from a business card. The check box is static and exists independent of a hardcopy rendering of the data and is not recorded in a memory in response to rendering a hardcopy representation of the image data. Thus, the existence or non-existence of the check box is not related to hardcopy rendering of data. Accordingly, Skantze does not disclose recording an identifier and image data in memory in response to rendering a hardcopy representation of the image data, as recited in the subject claims. Ohmori does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Skantze.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, the combination of Skantze and Ohmori do not teach or suggest the subject invention as recited in independent claims 1, 18, or 20 (or claims 2-4, 8-14, 16-17 and 21 which respectively depend therefrom). Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Second Obviousness Rejection

The examiner has rejected claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Skantze in view of Ohmori and further in view of Wolff (UK Patent Application No. 2306669). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Claims 5 and 6 depend from independent claim 1, and Wolff does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Skantze. Wolff discloses a manual entry interactive paper and electronic document handling and process system (See Abstract). Wolff does not contemplate recording an identifier and image data in memory in response to rendering a hardcopy representation of image data. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, the combination of Skantze, Ohmori and Wolff do not teach or suggest the subject claims. Accordingly, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted that the claims in the subject application are now in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Mark Svat, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

4/17/06

Date



Mark S. Svat, Reg. No. 34,261
Kevin M. Dunn, Reg. No. 52,842
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582